



- Q1.** 1.3 pg. 7, Point of Contact indicates Vendors must not communicate with any Department staff except with the procurement officer. 4.2.5.3.5 Assessment of Benefits and Impact, pg. 22, states consultation with local DHR surrounding changes is required and should be documented. Is it acceptable to talk to local DHR about proposed programming for this grant?
- R1. No. Consultation with the County DHR surrounding proposed changes may be conducted post award and should be documented and agreed upon.**
- Q2.** If we want to add supportive information such as a Table of Services, Organizational chart, etc. can it be added behind the section we are writing instead of it being an Appendix?
- R2. Yes.**
- Q3.** Pg. 40 Space/ Rent/Lease: please clarify about the comparable rent statements – are these to be included in the grant or just maintained in the local office
- R3. Yes. The required forms must be included in proposals. The forms are available on the Department's web site in the Family Services Center RFP folder.**
- Q4.** 4.2.5.3.5 - Assessment of Benefits and Impact: it references, in italics, that "If a current contract is held with DHR for these services, Vendors must include an evaluative narrative for FY12 related to program goals and objectives, summarizing feedback from consumer satisfaction surveys, families' ratings of goal progress, Family Service Center Standards review findings, and Administrative Site Visit of Peer Review findings (if applicable)."
- The next paragraph states "If a current contract is held with DHR for these services, Vendors must include scores on the Family Service Center Standards Review completed in FY 2011 and FY 2012.
- The last Peer Review and Family Service Center Standards Review any Family Service Center had was in the 2006 - 2007 time frame. FIRST Family Service Center has not had an Administrative Site Visit since 2008. All three of these processes are SDHR initiated and implemented.
- Please give clarification on how current Vendors are supposed to address these sections.
- R4. See Amendment #1.**
- Q5.** pp 21-22, Section 4.2.5.3.5 Assessment of Benefits and Impact. On page 22 of the RFP, Standards Review, Peer Review are requested to be included. We have not had the DHR reviews in several years. Should we state this in this section?
- R5. See R4.**
- Q6.** p. 24, Section 5. Budget. Originally when we were approved as vendors for the Family Service Centers monies, our match requirement was 25%, due to the monies being all federal dollars. However, our match requirements for the past several years have been about 21% of the total Project Amount, since part of the total funds were provided by a non-federal source that did not require a match. The RFP states we are to provide 25% match, which will reduce the actual dollar amount we receive by several thousand dollars. Is the 25% requirement correct, resulting in a lower DHR share for the centers?



R6. Yes, the 25% match requirement is correct.

Q7. p. 7, Section 1.3. Point of Contact; pp. 21-22, Section 4.2.5.3.5, Assessment of Benefits and Impact. On page 7 we are instructed not to communicate with any Department staff except the Procurement Officer. On page 22, we are instructed to consult with County DHR regarding any changes in the proposal. Which instruction do we follow?

R7. See R1.

Q8. Section 1.0, page 7 & Section 5.0 Budget, page 24

Lowndes County is not listed in either referenced section of the RFP; the current contract for Montgomery County includes a satellite center located in Lowndes County. Does the current RFP anticipate/expect continuation of the Lowndes County center as part of the contract for Montgomery County?

R8. See Amendment #1.

Q9. Section 4.2.5.2 Vendor Financial Stability, page 21

Our full 2010 audit statement is 28 pages in length which would constitute nearly a third of the allowable pages. Can we meet this requirement by including the 2010 auditor's letter and the portions of the full audit that pertain to the current center contract?

R9. Yes.

Q10. Section 4.2.5.3.5 Assessment of Benefits and Impact, pages 21-22

The RFP references that vendors holding a current contract, "must include scores on the Family Service Center Standards Reviews completed in FY2011 and FY 2012." We are not aware of a formal Standards Review conducted by ADHR for those two years; therefore, we need assistance in identifying what "scores" are being referenced.

R10. See R4.

Q11. Section 4.2.5.3. - Assessment of Benefits and Impacts, page 22

The narrative states in an italicized note that if a Vendor has a current contract with DHR for these service , the Vendor must include "Family Service Center Standards review findings, and Administrative Site Visit or Peer Review findings (if applicable)." If a Vendor has a current contract but has not had a DHR administered Standards Review, Administrative Site Visit or Peer Review, should the Vendor indicate that status? A Vendor, may, however; have undergone a Standards Review and a Peer Review through the Alabama Network of Family Resource Centers (ANFRC) and could report those findings. The Standards Review Process has been re-designed through ANFRC as has the scoring rubric and the Peer Review process. Those results for most ANFRC Vendors would be available.

R11. See R4.

Q12. Section 5: BUDGET, page 24

The designated county area budgeted amounts of combined federal and local funds, with the 25% match that is required, indicates that the DHR share is reduced from the previous funding cycle. Is that an intended reduction, or an assumption that current vendors were providing a 25% match already and the DHR share would be the same as the current funding cycle? That is not the case since the Vendor match has been less than 25%, actually 21.25%. Such reduction would impact in the ability of the center to provide the current level of services.



R12. The match requirement during the specified contract term for this procurement will be 25%.

Q13. Section 1.3, Point of Contact, page 7 and Assessment of Benefits and Impact, page 22

On page 7 the RFP states, "Vendors must not communicate with an Department staff or officials regarding this procurement with the exception of the procurement officer." On page 22, in italics, it states: "Consultation with the County DHR surrounding proposed changes is required and should be documented." Our County DHR Director serves as an Ex-Officio member of the Board of Directors and would be privy to any and all information related program development and implementation and is engaged in that process on an on-going basis. How do we proceed?

Do we need to include any letters of support?

R13. See R1. No.